DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 014 UD 014 312

AUTHOR Drachler, Norman
TITLE Educational Effects of Integration.
PUB DATE 4 Apr 74
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Conference on School Desegregation: "Brown Plus Twenty and into the Future"
AVAILABLE FROM Institute of Afro-American Affairs, 10 Washington Place, Room 500, New York, New York 10003 ($1.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Curriculum Development; *Educational Change; *Educational Practice; *Educational Quality; Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; Government Role; Human Relations; *Integration Effects; Integration Methods; Literature Reviews; *School Integration; Supreme Court Litigation; Textbook Bias

ABSTRACT

The review of the press and other media following the May 17, 1954 opinion of "Brown v. Board of Education" summarized here leaves little doubt that the message was not misunderstood. There exists today more segregation in the large cities of our nation than there was in 1954. The schools, though not responsible for the exodus to the suburbs, did however contribute to it. We did not in the 1950's develop a strategy nationally, on a state basis, nor even on a large-city basis, that would seek to meet the challenge of Brown. By the early 1940's we had begun to intensify our work on intergroup relations. This movement assumed a more formal, institutional structure after 1954. School districts did establish human relations departments, but in most instances these had no effect on school programs or practices. A review of the literature of the past 20 years reveals so much involvement with tactics to achieve or prevent desegregation that the educational effects are almost obscured. In addition to the legal issue, we were preoccupied with open enrollment plans, the Princeton plan, the educational park, the "magnet" school, and last but not least, busing. And since school systems tend to be highly decentralized, a concentrated effort for educational planning becomes a most difficult and unmanageable task to evaluate. (Author/JM)

ED 094014 S

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EDUCATIONAL EFFECTS OF INTEGRATION

Conference on School Desegregation:

"Brown Plus Twenty and Into The Future"

April 4, 1974

UD 014312

Norman Drachler
Director
Institute for Educational Leadership
of
The George Washington University
Washington, D. C.

Copies of this paper may be obtained by writing to:

Institute of Afro-American Affairs
10 Washington Place, Room 500
New York, New York 10003 $1.00 each

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EDUCATIONAL EFFECTS OF INTEGRATION

The Supreme Court Decision of May 17th, 1954, was not one of those events whose importance or historic significance had to wait for time to elapse before its implications for American Society and education became discernable. Though there were some early efforts to question the legality of the decision - a review of the press and other media following the opinion of Brown v. Board of Education - leaves little doubt that the message was not misunderstood. The Court's decision was discussed in the U. S. News and World Report of May 28, 1954, the Saturday Evening Post editorial of June 19, 1954, entitled "Segregation Was Dead Before the Court Decision," the July, 1954 issue of the Atlantic, and many other journals and newspapers.

On September 11, 1954, nearly four months after Brown v. Board of Education, the Saturday Review devoted a complete issue to the subject "The Public Schools' Five Crises." Crisis number three was 'the desegregation of Negro education ordered by the May 17th decision of the Supreme Court.' The other four crises were: (1) 'criticism of the curriculum and teaching methods as they apply to fundamental skills,' (2) 'suggested solutions to the problem of providing more and better classrooms at costs the public can afford,' (4) 'juvenile delinquency, a parent-teacher problem that has grown alarmingly in recent months,' and (5) 'the threat to learning and free inquiry implicit in the activities of such groups as the House of Representatives Reece Committee.'

Norman Cousins wrote the lead editorial which was quite supportative of the educational establishment. He questioned whether some of the critics were actually concerned with the flaws in education or more with "the reduction or even the repudiation of public education itself." Cousins observed that: "The central problem is not to find new principals but to make the old ones work, not to create new values but to get rid of the old assumptions."

Apropos the Supreme Court decision the special issue also contained a review of Harry Ashmore's recent book The Negro and The Schools, a study supported by a grant of The Ford Foundation's Fund for the Advancement of Education, and written before the Supreme Court Brown Decision. The reviewer hailed the book as "...the most important volume recently published in the field of education," an opinion later shared by others.

Ashmore recognized the role that communities would play in the implementation of integration and concluded on the rather hopeful note: "My experience as a journalist in the company of scholars has strengthened my conviction that no problems are beyond resolution by reasonable men - not even the thorny ones that lie in the uncertain area between the polar attitudes of the American white, who does not yet accept the Negro as his equal, and the American Negro, who is not satisfied with anything else."

The back pages of this issue of the Saturday Review carried an ad on Schools in Transition edited by a Robin Williams and Margaret W. Ryan, the second study to follow Ashmore's pioneer effort. Ashmore wrote the introduction to this second volume in which he discussed the May 17th decision with cautioned optimism. He explained that the purpose of these studies was not to advocate a position "...but to make available factual information which may throw light upon the shadowy area of the nation's total educational structure." He also quoted from his earlier book, some concerns expressed by Owen J. Roberts, former Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and then Chairman of the Fund's Board:

> This volume and those that follow it are intended to bring into focus the dimensions and the nature of the complex educational problems that in many ways provides a significant test of American democracy. The ultimate solution of that problem will rest with the men and women who make and execute public school policy in thousands of local school districts and their actions will be conditioned by the degree of understanding of the general public which supports their efforts with its tax dollars.

Ashmore's introduction to Schools in Transition was dated September 25, 1954, Little Rock, Arkansas.

But back to the September 11th issue of the Saturday Review. It also contained an article by Fred M. Hechinger, who devoted his attention primarily to the Supreme Court decision. Hechinger was optimistic and directed his remarks directly at the South. He began his article as follows:

> "They may not know it now. In fact, they may never quite realize it. But the more than three million youngsters who have just begun to go to school are members of a historic class: the school year 1954-55 will be known in the textbooks some hundreds of years from now as the end of an old era and the beginning of the new.

Hechinger did not foresee immediate compliance, but he anticipated little violence since "...the mores of America have been moving closer and closer toward the ideal." He cautioned that little change will occur during that year but he expressed the belief that although "...some will perhaps still be segregated twenty years from now; but most will not; and the legal pattern will be aligned with the American idea."

Hechinger's opinion was shared by many including some present here today. It was a victory for those who had cringed for many years over the disparity between our heritage and reality. It was a promise that our former rhetoric would be translated into meaningful deeds. The joyous and supportive public demonstration by the university students of Liberia, following the court's decision, expressing confidence in America's promise was a welcome harbinger to those of us who cared about our international image.

Now, let us turn to an educational journal and note its reactions to Brown. The November 1954 and 1955 issues of Educational Leadership, the Journal of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, a division of the NEA, were devoted to the May 17, 1954, Supreme Court Opinion. The 1955 issue, "Integrating Minority Groups into the Public Schools," had an editorial by William Van Til with the title, "Now It's "How" and "When" - Not "Whether"," an article by Dan Dodson directed at complacent educators north of the Mason Dixon line, entitled "The North, Too, Has Segregation Problems," and several other articles by educators dealing with various phases of desegregation and integration. Van Til stated: "On the issue of desegregation and integration, there can be no abdication of leadership responsibilities, no educational evasion." Dodson reminded educators in the North that though they may not have de jure segregation - they do segregate by 'programs,' by 'ignoring,' by 'zoning,' and by 'grouping.'" He wrote: "Desegregation is a southern problem and is being attacked on the legal and political fronts. Integration of the races is a socio-psychological problem, national - if not - international in scope, and the concern of educators in the larger communities without regard to region." It is somewhat ironic, that in May, 1974, when the United States Supreme Court may issue an opinion on the present Detroit segregation case that the November 1955, issue discussed above had a photograph for its cover of an integrated classroom, "...courtesy of the Detroit Public Schools."

The November, 1955, issue of Educational Leadership also contained the resolutions adopted by The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development at its March, 1955 Convention, on the Brown Decision. It re-affirmed its stand on 'unrestricted' membership, "recognized" its obligation to eliminate segregation, and committed its membership to the support and implementation of the Court's decision. Though this may not seem worthy of mentioning today - it should be recalled that following the organization's stand on integration - membership within its fold was regarded as 'subversive' in some states in this country.

When one reflects upon the 'educational effects of integration' the task becomes complex and frustrating. One wishes he were a lawyer rather than a former school administrator. The action was in the court rather than in the classroom. There are, of course, incidents, case studies, etc. where one can point with pride to educational efforts that buttressed integration. But these do not in the opinion of this author reflect a national thrust or program.

A review of the terms used in relation to integration complicates the task of the educational consequences of the Brown Decision. 'Compensatory' education, education for the disadvantaged, first the culturally deprived, then the culturally different, human relations, racial balance, intercultural relations, equality of educational opportunity, desegregation, etc. all are related to, but not regarded in this discussion as integration.

Pettigrew once remarked in an address in this city, that desegregation is a mere mix - and that it can be good or bad. It is a prerequisite for integregation. Integration, on the other hand, he said, refers to the quality of the racial contact.

Back in 1955, Kenneth Clark, in an address, distinguished between desegregation and integration as he saw it then, one year after Brown. The former, he observed referred to institutional changes. "Desegregation is the removal of racial barriers to behavior and to the enjoyment of civil rights [privledges. It involves social, political, judicial, and community decisions and action." His description of integration was as follows:

> Integration is an individual process involving attitudinal changes dependent on the removal of fears, hatreds, suspicions, sterotypes, and superstitions. In a very real sense it involves questions of personal choice and personal stability. Creation of an integrated school requires a longer time. It must be 'gradual.' It is clear, however, that an integrated school cannot be obtained before bringing about a desegregated school.

Fifteen years later Lenore Bennett, Jr. in Life magazine, August, 1970, defines integration as follows: "Integration is more than doing with, it is more than being in the presence of - it is being with and refers not to physical proximity but to the quality and meaning of the togetherness... Integration, truly defined, is simply human solidarity, the recognition of man by man."

For purposes of clarity allow me to list several prereq isites that I regard essential to school integration, though you may wish to add others and delete some. In our heteroganous society educational integration as I see it is the very essence of what America claimed and extolled for its public schools. It involves equality of educational opportunity; it concerns itself with the dignity of each individual; it recognizes as essential ingredients of learning in a democratic society, the intrinsic value of different racial, religious, and socio-economic groups, learning and sharing educational experiences
it assures learning for each individual; its curriculum includes the life experiences and aspirations of the various segments of our society; its personnel is representative of the cultural background comprising its learners; its facilities and services are geared to help children achieve to their highest potential; and its policies are shaped by the various forces that makeup our society, participating as equal partners and with shared accountability, and in quest of a common goal. Integrated education is not merely concerned with the hopes or goals of the children and parents involved - but also with the aspirations of the institution and its professionals for their clientele. Segregated education in a pluralistic society is inadequate education for all - white or black, Spanish-speaking or Asian.

It is known that there exists today more segregation or resegregation in the large cities of our nation that there was in 1954. The schools though not responsible for the exodus to suburbs by large portions of the white population and some segments of middle-class minority groups - did however, in my opinion, contribute to this exodus. We underestimated the crisis facing America and its schools, we did not launch the type of creative program that the Brown Decision called for and we soon lost the momentum that the 1954 Supreme Court opinion provided for us. We, in the North, expressed dismay over Little Rock, while conditions in our own backyard became worse year by year. I say this though well aware of the financial difficulties faced by urban schools, the shortages of teachers, the obsolescence of buildings, etc. Yet, we did not in the 1950s, develop a strategy, nationally, on a state basis, nor to my knowledge, even on a large-city basis, that would seek to meet the challenge of Brown. The de-facto formula became a shield that blured our vision to the larger opportunity which Brown presented.

Due to the threat of totalitarianism and war in the late 1930s and the early 1940s we had begun to intensify our work on intergroup relations, materials, and guides for our schools. It was not a massive educational effort - but it had its strong advocates, who were a sturdy though lonely group. Some members of the school establishment looked upon these as 'proponents' 'good will' or 'naive do-gooders'; others regarded them as dangerous radicals, but mostly they were ignored by the profession. William Van Til, one

of the architects of this movement, traced this period in an article in the Third edition of the Encyclopedia of Eduational Research, 1960, which proved very helpful for my discussion today. He described the four stages of this educational effort: "First, the missionary stage, second, the period of simplistic solutions when we hailed the'Springfield Plan' and held international and intercultural festivals, "with little research to validate our activities": third, the era of promising practices, when the National Council of Christians and Jews, the Anti-Defamation League, The Bureau of Intercultural Education, and others published case studies of successful ventures in human relations by schools and we increased the use of coffee in this country by introducing that vehicle for bringing about change, called the "workshop"; and (4), last but not least, the period of research.

Thus when Brown came along we dusted off Vickery and Cole's Intercultural Education in America (1943), Hortense Powdermaker's Probing Our Prejudices (1944), the National Council for Social Studies' Democratic Human Relations (1945), the John Dewey Society's Intercultural Attitudes in the Making (1947), Arnold Rose's Studies in the Reduction of Prejudice (1948), and we gave these status in our program. Some even turned to Allison Davis' Social Class Influences Upon Learning (1948) and his earlier book with Dollard Children of Bondage. These were followed by

Klineberg's Tensions Affecting International Understanding (1950) Trager and Radke's Study in the Schools of Philadelphia, They Learn What They Live (1952), and Gordon Allport's The Nature of Prejudice, published in 1954, the year of Brown. Some of the intercultural efforts were directed at teacher training. Hilda Taba's Intergroup Education in Public Schools (1952) and Lloyd and Ellena Cook's College Programs in Intergroup Relations were efforts to prepare a new teacher for an age of understanding and appreciating differences. This listing undoubtedly omits some important contributions - but lack of space does not permit me to list all.

The intercultural movement of the 1940s assumed a more formal, institutional structure after 1954. School districts did establish human relations departments of intercultural bureaus, but in most instances these were 'service' or 'auxiliary' units and did not have the line authority or clout to affect the schools' programs or practices. In too many instances it was a 'cardiac' or 'gastronomic' approach to better human understanding.

This apathy prevailed, although by 1954 there was additional evidence that earlier efforts were not adequate to change the prevailing prejudice in our society. Van Til pointed out in 1950 that instruction in the schools actually contributed to the frustration of minority groups; Trager and Radke in their 1952 publication concluded that "children are aware of racial and religious differences,

that they did learn undemocratic behavior and values in the adult social environment in which they live and that attitudes can be changed; Cole by 1953 contended that "we took too much for granted by assuming that knowledge or information alone would change attitudes "; and Ashley Montagu insisted back in 1947 that "social and economic arrangements must accompany educational programs for fostering desirable attitudes, or institutional pressures will lead to a resumption of original attitudes." Kenneth and Mamie Clark touched on another important aspect of society's impact on Negro children in an article of the Journal of Negro Education in the 1950s. The Clarks revealed some serious aspects of Negro children's attitudes in the North. Although they found no significant difference between Northern and Southern Negro children in the "awareness of racial differences," Northern children had "a more definite preference for white skin color than children in Southern communities." The response of schools to these findings does not reflect general awareness or sensitivity to these issues.

I have inferred earlier that the educational effects of integration have not been too substantial, yet, I dread the thought of reflecting on these past 20 years without the Brown Decision's presence. Those of us in 1954 who, like Fred Hechinger, hoped to see Brown implemented by 1974, misread the deepseated racism in our land, both South and North;

we did not fully comprehend Myrdal's warning written in 1944, that "The main conflict" as it pertains to the education of Negro "is between the ever present egalitarian American creed, on the one hand, and the caste interest on the other." And we overestimated the school's ability or determination to affect change.

In 1955, one year after Brown, Kenneth Clark observed at a conference sponsored by the Anti-Defamation League:

> For the most part education and educators have not taken the leadership even in the desegregation of the public schools. They have been content to assume a passive, defensive, apologetic or at best, equivocating and ambiguous role in meeting what is probably the most important issue which has ever faced American public education.

Four years later, in 1959, Dan Dodson wrote in the Review of Educational Research: "Available studies do not attach great importance to the leadership of the school administrator, at least in initiating desegregation." A very recent study by Kirby Harris Crain and Rossell, Political Strategies in Northern School Desegregation, does state that: "...present data indicates that superintendents play a very important role in bringing about desegregation." And I might add, often resulting in their seeking a new position - a conclusion that I can support without too extensive research.

A review of the literature of the past 20 years reveals so much involvement with tactic to achieve or prevent desegregation that the educational effects are almost obscured. In addition to the legal issue, we were preoccupied with open enrollment plans, the Princeton plan, the educational park, the 'magnet' school, the 'Meade's' school, and last but not least, busing. And being a highly decentralized school system, spread over 50 states having some 20,000 school districts with contrasting conditions and sets of values a concerted effort for educational planning becomes a most difficult and unmanageable task to evaluate.

I was also asked to comment on the educational effect of integration upon curriculum. During my 35 years of experience in the schools I have found that curriculum in general is not an item of high priority in the eyes of the public, unless one attempts to introduce sex education, or simulation games. I do believe, however, that Brown, along with the 'Sputnick' era, were responsible for increasing some ferment over the school curriculum. Educators began to recognize that shortcomings in curriculum existed not merely in the treatment of minorities, but that it did not serve well the needs of all youth.

Content as well as methodology were challenged. Teachers were still dependent upon textbooks and in too many instances these were the

primary vehicles for teaching. In a sense this concern over textbooks reflected a dilemma of American public education. Although we were a heterogenous society from our early days, public education was primarily influenced by a strong Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, middle-class and often rural orientation. The textbooks were the guardians of this heritage.

The criticism over racism in textbooks, although not organized or centralized, did however, begin to have some effect. The complaints dealt generally with three areas of concern: (1) omissions in the textbooks; (2) the need to update texts and materials to differences in our society or correct outright errors; and (3) sensitivity, or more precisely, the lact of sensitivity in our text and materials to differences in our culture. Publishers, although at first defensive soon began to make some changes, but always keeping in mind the broad range of their clientele. The critics though not satisfied with the quality or the rate of progress had nevertheless made some headway. Some school districts began to prepare and publish their own materials. In 1968 the Detroit Board of Education, upon the recommendation of its staff, decided no longer to be satisfied merely with the best book available, and voted not to purchase any new books that year since none of the texts presented, met its standards on integration. A move, by the way, which brought some quicker responses from publishers.

Other developments began to take place in 1960s. State departments of education began to draw up policy statements concerning desegregation and racial prejudice in the schools. The State Department of Education in California issued a report on bias in social studies books. The Great Cities Research Council representing the 20 largest systems in the nation established in 1968 the Racial Equality Committee of the Research Council. In its resolution to attain the Council's goal of providing quality education for all, the Committee said: "...it is imperative that we unequivocally address ourselves to the relationship which exists between quality education and racial equality."

The difficulty of assessing the effect of the curriculum upon integrated education is the lack of any central force than governs American education. The American Association of School Administrators had speakers on the subject of desegregation at its annual convention in Atlantic City throughout the past twenty years. In 1970, it published a bibliography for its members compiled by ERIC on the Impact of Racial Issues in Educational Administration. Other national organizations and institutions adopted resolutions but these lacked the power of implementation. Thousands of articles were published dealing with the various findings affecting the learning of children. Yet, a mere count of titles, would lead one to believe that integrated education was a problem of the poor, the minorities, instead of a national need. The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development produced yearbooks and countless monographs on improving the curriculum. Though few were aimed directly at

integration, nevertheless, the collective impact of their resolutions and recommendations could have had greater influence upon the if school administrators and school boards would have grappled with these issues rather than with school finance, school buildings, etc.

I am not placing the blame entirely upon the school establishment - American society and its priorities for education must share the responsibility for the continued indifference. When one looks at the large mass of educational research in curriculum development that was accumulated during the 1950s and early 1960s - I think it's fair to state that there was a wide gap between the scientific information available in the field and its application by school practitioners. This, however, applied not merely to integration, but to education in general - administration as well as curriculum.

Probably the greatest force to influence educational innovation was the Federal government's legislation of the 1960s. Federal aid to education existed before Brown but its gigantic increase and creative efforts during the 1960s were undoubtedly due to the increasing disatisfaction with the quality of our schools and the frustration of the decade that followed Brown. More experimentation and innovation followed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 - than in

any previous period in American educational history. Headstart, Follow Through the various titles from I and up, R & D centers, the Right to Read program, the involvement of parents, particulary the poor - these and many other programs helped to initiate some basic changes in our schools. The Supreme Court decision of 1954 reminded America of its fundamental goals and ordered a restructuring of our schools to achieve these goals, and the Federal acts of the 1960s provided us with some of the means to implement some of our objectives. Certainly as in the case of Brown we can point to many shortcomings of the Federal aid program - but again, I dread to speculate where we would have been today without it.

It is still too early to assess the relationship of the effects of compensatory educational programs upon integration. The threat of losing Federal funds caused many school systems to desegregate and to make efforts to improve the effectiveness of their programs. In 1967, the National Society for the Study of Education devoted its yearbook to "The Educationally Retarded and Disadvantaged." With an article by Professor Marjorie B. Smiley, discussing "Objectives of

Educational Programs for the Educationally Retarded and the Disadvantaged." Insofar as the utilization of these programs by the profession in behalf of integration, she observes:

> It is at once surprising and discouraging to find in the programs so little recognition of desegregation and classroom integration as a means to the achievement of affective social objectives. The almost universal efforts to identify and seperate the disadvantaged from other children, albeit for compensatory services and instruction, seem ill designed to realize the avowed aim of raising the child's self-esteem.

The concern of Professor Smiley is particularly significant, since the decade from 1957 to 1967 has been regarded by some as a period in which a national effort was made to achieve quality in education. Although the extent of this national effort may have been overstated and the major thrust of Federal programs did not actually begin until after 1965, Professor Smiley's concern is still real today. With all due respect and appreciation to the various reports by dedicated educators to attain an integrated program, unless I have missed what is happening on the wide educational arena, I do not know of a survey that demonstrates a broad, nationwide movement for change. A statement printed in 1973 in Stent, Hazard, and Rivlin's

publication, Cultural Pluralism in Education, by the Steering Committee of the National Coalition for Cultural Pluralism declared:

> There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that America is now engaged in a social revolution that will thoroughly test her national policies and attitudes regarding human differences... Blacks, Spanish-Americans, women, college students, elderly people, etc. are all finding themselves victimized by technological and social systems which look upon significant differences among people as unhealthly and inefficient...

If I sound overpessimistic or unfair let us contrast the positive titles I quoted for the 1940s and compare these with the most widely read, or at least talked about books that appeared after Broum: Cremin's The Transformation of the School, Bruner's The Process of Education, Conant's Slums and Suburbs, Gardner's Self Renewal, Bloom, Davis, and Hess' Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation, Goodman's Compulsory Miseducation, Clark's Dark Ghetto, Kozol's Death at an Early Age, Haskins' Diary of a Harlem Schoolteacher, Holt's How Children Fail, Wright's What Black Educators are Saying, Silberman's Crisis in the Classroom, Katz' Class, Bureauracy in Schools, Greer's The Great School Legend, and Illitch's Deschooling Society.

Although I do not share some of the apocalyptic conclusions expressed by a few of the authors mentioned, yet even the more

friendly critics express concern over the schools' shortcomings in bringing about educational change. There is, however, no question in my mind that Brown was very influencial in stimulating educational research and reassessment of our programs during these past twenty years.

The answer to the question raised by your planners, as to what have been the educational achievement results of integration depends on which survey or author you read. It also leads me to question why after 150 years of extolling the concept of public education for a democracy - do we need to prove it only when it concerns integration? But my personal conclusions, based on the findings of Coleman, Clark, Pettigrew, and the Civil Rights Commission, lead me to believe that the results, though measured under conditions extremely unfavorable to learning, were positive in general, particularly at the high school level. The very recent reports of the Civil Rights Commission and the National Opinion Research Study, prepared for the United States Office of Education sound most promising - though they stress that success is not accidential but very much dependent upon the nature of the program.

I have stated earlier that I dread to think of the past 20 years without Brown. Although education, society, or both have not achieved what Brown has required and enabled us to do, the accomplishments though small when compared with the challenge,

must not be disregarded. Education after Brown is not the same as it was prior to 1954. The growing recognition of the rights of Black children has to a degree helped to focus on the shortcomings of our schools in regard to the American Indian, the Spanish-speaking child, the Asian youngster, women, and others who were neglected or homogenized under the pressure of American conformity.

In Education for an Open Society, published only several months ago, Samuel Ethridge writes:

> In 1934, a Black child born in 95 percent of the counties in Alabama could not receive a public education beyond the 10th grade in any school, white or Black. Now, in spite of the difficulties and odds against him, the Black child in any county in the United States can expect 12 years of public education, even if the whites withdraw in protest of his coming...
>
> The South has not overcome many of its shortcomings, but it has without a doubt made a 180 degree turn since 1954. A person who moved from the South in 1954 and never returned until 1974 will experience cultural shock in every aspect of life from the moment of arrival to time of departure.

School and society in the North are also not the same after Brown contrary to my general pessimism. The curriculum though not integrated is at least beginning to recognize the nature of the cultural revolution that Brown influenced. The

selection of staff, though still limited is beginning to assume a more pluralistic image. Discrimination and exploitation of over 300 years is too great a price for any of us to be satisfied with these token gains, but, when discussing Brown these changes must be recognized. Brown was of course a decision that affected more than schools. Housing, employment, and other shortcomings of our society were modified by the 1954 decision.

My concern over the educational effects of integration is influenced by the disparity between educational research and educational practice, and between the gap of the school's own stated objectives and its day to day activities. Why have not the findings of Deutch, Bloom, and Piaget had a greater impact upon school practice? Where are the insights of Allison Davis or Horace Bond affecting the schools attitudes towards the poor? The findings of Kenneth Clark are probably better known than any social scientist - yet, how widespread is his influence or that of Flanders, Guba, and others? Bruner and Goodlad have enriched our understanding of curriculum - but how deep is their impact upon school programs? Tyler and others in the behavioral sciences have provided us with new horizons for educational planning - how much of it is translated into school practice? Men like Lipham, Hemphill, Griffiths, and others have produced a mass of research affecting school administration - how far do educators test its validity or

implications? Lawrence Cremin and others are devoting their professional lives to reinterpreting our educational history - how seriously does the profession examine their findings? Possibly these researchers know a great deal about the educational forces that can influence schools - but they don't understand the school itself and what it takes to change it. Possibly school administrators and teachers have not been good learners or effective agents of change. Possibly 20 years is not sufficient time to change a school system. Possibly it is a task that the school cannot do alone. I worry about those, outside and inside the profession, who express doubts about our ability to bring about integration and therefore say: "Let us therefore try to proceed with education." The alternative seems to suggest a dichotomy which I regard dangerous both to the hopes of a democratic society and quality education.

My last assignment (and I have skipped a few) was to comment on the future. Projection is a skill or talent that educational administrators, especially former school superintendents, have not demonstrated much success in the past. Though an optimist or occasionally a discouraged optimist - I now worry about the next decade. I hope it's only a sign of age. But education has not in the past been a successful agent for social change. In a society that seems to reveal strong conservative or even reactionary

attitudes, coupled with growing pressures upon boards of education, committed educators will need to demonstrate unusual skill and courage to survive, if quality integrated education is to advance. Elton Mayo once observed that: "Society does not of itself train us in the social skills which its complex relations require." If integration is to progress in the schools it will require commitment and know how on the part of the profession and the community working jointly to accomplish this task. Thus far, the school has not demonstrated this talent.

A key to the future of integration and to educational change was suggested to me in an essay by the late Professor Heschel, a staunch protagonist of integration, although his remarks were made in a general context. He said: "All that is creative in man stems from the seeds of endless discontent. New insight begins when satisfaction comes to an end, and when all that has been said and done looks like distortion." If dissatisfaction alone is a necessary ingredient for change - we are ready for a revolution. But the question remains what form or shape will that dissatisfaction take, what type of seed will be planted? My belief is that a metropolitan area cannot hope to prosper or survive without developing healthy coalitions with healthy central cities. The central city is the heartbeat of the metropolitan area and its cultural,

social, and economic needs cannot be disregarded. It is this common need,which I hope will lead us to a more affirmative realization of the meaning and challenge of Brown and its implications for the improvement of a democratic America.

In one of his works Professor Richard Hoffstadter observed that "The United States was the only country in the world that began with perfection and aspired to progress." Today, however, Edmund Bacon, in his recent book Design of Cities, says: "We are in danger of losing one of the most important concepts of mankind, that the future is what we make it." Brown and some of the judicial opinions that followed reasserted our belief that the future is open for change and improvement. The American dream that has been a nightmare for some can be realized for all.